

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending, with claims 1 and 15 being independent. Claims 1-4, 7, 9, and 15 have been amended. No new matter has been added. In view of the following remarks, all of the claims should be allowed.

Objections to the Specification

The specification is objected to for allegedly including acronyms and trademarks. The objections are traversed.

The acronyms SAP and XI have been expanded to phrases. In addition, trademarks and several names in trade have been capitalized in response to requests in the official action. Thus, these objections are overcome. However, it is noted that Oracle and Business Intelligence Solutions, Cognos are not found in the application; consequently, any objections with reference to these terms are moot.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 9 are objected to for including typos. These typos have been corrected and, thus, these objections are moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-20 are rejected for allegedly being indefinite for failing to particular point out and distinctly claim subject matter. In particular, the claims have been rejected for including the terms “abstraction layer” and “configured to.” These rejections are traversed.

With regards to “abstraction layer,” the rejected language has been removed, thus, these rejections are moot.

With regards to “configured to,” all claims including the rejected language have been amended to remove “configured,” thus, these rejections are moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-20 are rejected for allegedly being anticipated by Srikanth et al. (U.S. Pub. 2003/0208460; Srikanth). These rejections are traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 15 are not anticipated by Srikant for at least the reasons that 1) Srikant does not disclose use of OLTP data, 2) Srikant does not disclose integration of OLTP data with a multidimensional database or OLAP data, and 3) Srikant does not disclose generating a common meta model data set.

Srikant describes methods and systems to generate and link reports (Title). Requirements, such as business requirements, may be associated with objects used to generate report specifications (Abstract; ¶ 31). The report specifications may then be used, with a data store schema, to generate report meta data ("specifications in XML format can be provided....for the automated processing of the specifications into report metadata...specifications are inputted into the additional tools along with a data store schema"; ¶ 32). As disclosed, an example data store is a Teradata warehouse distributed by NCR Corporation (¶ 35).

No Disclosure of OLTP Data

Claims 1 and 15 include features directed to the use of data sources providing OLTP data or data access programs accessing OLTP data. For example, claim 1 recites "one or more data sources providing OLTP data." Similarly, claim 15 recites "a data access layer including one or more data access programs for accessing OLTP data."

The official action alleges that the Teradata warehouse disclosed in Srikant is the same as OLTP data. This is not the case. As shown in the enclosed articles, data from OLTP data sources and data from a data warehouse, such as the Teradata warehouse, differ significantly ("Teradata Warehouse ...is the latest episode in the continuing story of active data warehousing," emphasis added; Teradata Magazine, Teradata Warehouse 6.1: The story continues; available at <http://www.teradata.com/t/page/115862/index.html>; copy enclosed).

For example, OLTP data tends to be real-time data, whereas, data warehouse data is not up-to-date. For example, a tutorial on data warehouses states:

"The OLTP database records transactions in real time and aims to automate clerical data entry processes of a business entity. Addition, modification and deletion of data in the OLTP database is essential and the semantics of the application used in the front end impact on the organization of the data in the database.

The data warehouse on the other hand does not cater to real time operational requirements of the enterprise. It is more a storehouse of current and historical data

and may also contain data extracted from external data sources” (“Tutorial 2: Data Warehouse database and OLTP database,” emphasis added; available at <http://www.exforsys.com/content/view/1295/332/>; copy enclosed).

This difference is significant, as, for example, an important aspect of implementations of the subject matter is integration of OLTP data with data from OLAP sources. For example, paragraph 0041 of the present application recites:

“...data in the BI platform 116 comes with a time lag between data creation and the data’s availability for reporting. Hence, a data abstraction layer 106 on top of the data access layer 102 and service layer 104 integrates OLTP with OLAP reporting and leverages the benefits of both.”

No Disclosure of Integration of OLTP Data with Multidimensional Database / OLAP Data

Srikant does not disclose integration of OLTP data with multidimensional database or OLAP data.

Independent claims 1 and 15 include features directed to integration of OLTP data with a multidimensional database or OLAP data. In particular, claim 1 recites “a unified view module to integrate the OLTP data with the multidimensional database” and claim 15 recites “a unified view module providing a common meta-model for OLTP data integrated with OLAP data.”

Srikant allegedly discloses integration of OLTP data and a multidimensional data or OLAP data by the additional tools. However, this is not the case. As discussed above, the Teradata warehouse is not an OLTP data source that would provide OLTP data. Thus, the alleged integration could not be the same. This is significant, as, discussed above, integrating OLTP and OLAP data may leverage the benefits of both and reduce time lag.

Even so, there is no integration of data from different sources in Srikant. For example, in Srikant, data of a specific format is generated for a specific tool. For example, an OLAP specification is used to generate data in an OLAP format for an OLAP tool (see ¶ 65).

No Common Meta Model Data Set

Srikant does not disclose generating a common meta model data set.

Claims 1 and 15 include features directed to a common meta model data set. In particular, claim 1 recites “a unified view module ...to produce a common meta model data set” and claim 15 recites “a unified view module providing a common meta-model.” The common meta model is for integrated data. The meta model may be common as, for example, two sources of data may be described using a single meta model (“[b]y transforming data from different data sources into one metadata model, it is possible to relate one set of data to another”; specification, ¶ 16).

The alleged common meta model data set of Srikant is report meta data; however, this is not a common meta model data set for, as an example, OLTP data integrated with OLAP data (see e.g., claim 15). As disclosed in Srikant, the only data source for the report data is based on the data schema. Only one type of data, for example, OLAP data, is provided for the data schema.

Thus, for at least the reasons above, independent claims 1 and 15 are not anticipated by Srikant and are allowable. As claims 2-14 and 16-20 depend directly, or indirectly, on independent claims 1 and 15, these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons above.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, all of the claims are in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

Applicant is concurrently filing herewith a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement. If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-082/P2003P00266US.

Please update the attorney's docket number to reflect the new docket number, (attorney docket no. 34874-082/2003P00266US).

Date: _____

8/22/06

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Juliano
Reg. No. 54,780

Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
9255 Towne Centre Drive, Suite 600
San Diego, CA 92121
Customer No.: 64280
Tel.: 858/320-3031
Fax: 858/320-3001